

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	Ο.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,212		11/12/2003	Michael E. Connell	5083.1US (01-0428.01/US)	6326
24247	7590	05/25/2006		EXAMINER	
TRASK : P.O. BOX			WILSON, ALLAN R		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•		2815	
				DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<b></b>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,212	CONNELL ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allan R. Wilson	2815	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN.  .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05	May 2006		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is action is non-final.		
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allow		ters, prosecution as to the merits i	s
closed in accordance with the practice under			_
Disposition of Claims	,,		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-8,10-14,16-20 and 22-24</u> is/ard	a nanding in the application	•	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	awn ironi consideration.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-8,10-14,16-20 and 22-24</u> is/ard	a raiactad		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	e rejected.		
8) Claim(s) are subjected to.	lor alastian rasuirement		
	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(	(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documer</li> </ol>	nts have been received.		
<ol><li>Certified copies of the priority documer</li></ol>	nts have been received in A	Application No	
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the pri</li></ol>	ority documents have beer	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies no	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		(s)/Mail Date	
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0506</u>.</li> </ol>	5) ☐ Notice of 6) ☐ Other:	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office		: 	
	Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 05	506

## **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,827,771 to Ginn et al. ("Ginn") of record in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,798,558 to Tyson et al. ("Tyson").

With regards to claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, Ginn illustrates in figures 2-4B (entire document), particularly figure 2, a ROICS (such as a transimpedance amplifier, col. 1, lines 11-12) a semiconductor substrate 12 having a front side 12c and a back side 12b and having a low ratio of height to horizontal dimension (see FIG. 2);

an integrated circuit 14 on a portion of the front side;

layers (col. 3, lines 6-10) covering a portion of the integrated circuit causing a stress on at least a portion of the substrate; and

a stress or force balancing layer 18 covering at least a portion of the backside substantially balancing the stress caused by the passivation layer covering a portion of the integrated circuit (see col. 3, lines 27-58), the stress or force balancing layer comprising at least a physical vapor deposition material (sputtering Si<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> col. 3, lines 59-67). Additionally, "a

chemical vapor deposition material" and "a physical vapor deposition material" are product by process limitations (see MPEP 2113).

Ginn does not show specifically a passivation layer. Tyson discloses in the abstract and col. 7, lines 15 a transimpedance amplifier with a passivation layer (step 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a passivation layer. The motivation for doing this is to protect the underlying layers.

Regarding claims 2, 8, 14 and 20, Ginn illustrates in FIG. 2 the stress-balancing layer comprises a single component layer 18.

Regarding claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, Applicants are reminded that intended functional use (laser-marking) is given no patentable weight in claims drawn to structure. See In re Pearson 181 USPQ 641 and Ex parte Minks 169 USPO 120.

Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ginn and Tyson as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,954 to Cheon.

With regards to claim 5, Ginn and Tyson are discussed above, they do not show an adhesive layer attached to the device. Cheon illustrates in figure 1 and discloses in col. 4, lines 15-19 an adhesive layer attached to the device 30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an adhesive layer attaching to the device 30 to a heat sink 26. The motivation for doing this is to remove heat from the device.

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18 and 24, Applicants are reminded that intended functional use (laser-marking) is given no patentable weight in claims drawn to structure. See In re Pearson 181 USPQ 641 and Ex parte Minks 169 USPQ 120.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The arguments that Sakaki et al. could not be used as prior art was persuasive.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2815

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from an examiner should be directed to Primary Examiner Allan Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1738. Examiner Wilson can normally be reached 8:00-6:30 Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allan R. Wilson Primary Examiner 22 May 2006